

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
ASHEVILLE DIVISION
1:19 CR 16

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
WILLIAM GRONOSKY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

This matter is before the Court on Defendant’s Motion to Seal Unredacted Sentencing Memorandum (Doc. 31) (“Motion to Seal”).

In evaluating a motion to seal, the Court must “(1) provide public notice of the request to seal and allow interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object, (2) consider less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents, and (3) provide specific reasons and factual findings supporting its decision to seal the documents and for rejecting the alternatives.” Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc., 218 F.3d 288, 302 (4th Cir. 2000).

Here, the Court has considered the Motion to Seal, the public’s interest in access to the subject filings, and alternatives to sealing. The Court determines that sealing is necessary, as less restrictive means of handling the information are not sufficient.

Accordingly, Defendant’s Motion to Seal Unredacted Sentencing

Memorandum (Doc. 31) is **GRANTED**, and Defendant's unredacted sentencing memorandum (Doc. 32) is **SEALED** and shall remain sealed until further Order of the Court.

Signed: December 10, 2019

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "W. Carleton Metcalf", written over a horizontal line.

W. Carleton Metcalf
United States Magistrate Judge

